

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
Transatlantic Division, Corps of Engineers  
CETAD-CT P.O. Box 2250  
Winchester, Virginia 22604-1450

TADP 715-1-7

Pamphlet  
No. 715-1-7

20 January 1995

**Procurement**  
**BEST VALUE CONTRACTING**

1. PURPOSE. This pamphlet is intended to provide guidance to individuals involved in source selection process and establishes consistency of procedures for evaluating and selecting the appropriate source for contract award. Guidance contained herein pertains to competitively negotiated procurements, except for the procurement of AE services.

2. APPLICABILITY. This guidance applies to the Transatlantic Division (TAD), the Europe District, and all subordinate field activities.

3. REFERENCE.

a. FAR Subpart 15.6, Source Selection, and FAR Subpart 15.8, Price Negotiation.

b. DFARS 215.6, Source Selection, and DFARS 215.8, Price Negotiation.

c. AFARS 15.6, Source Selection, and AFARS 15.8, Price Negotiation.

d. EFARS 15.611, Best and Final Offer, and EFARS 15.805-5(a), Field Pricing Support.

e. Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement Manual No. 1, Formal Source Selection Procedures for Army Systems Acquisition, March 1991.

f. FAR Subpart 3.104, Procurement Integrity.

4. GENERAL.

a. Best Value Contracting is a procurement process that results in the most advantageous acquisition for the Government performed through an integrated assessment and trade off analysis between technical, management, and cost factors. Best Value Contracting entails a concise predetermination and communication by the Government to prospective offerors of the relative importance of evaluation factors in the source selection process.

b. Best value contracting is not appropriate for all negotiated acquisitions. It should not replace the prequalification process of construction contractors which successfully eliminates offerors which most likely cannot perform the scope of work.

c. In procurements where the desired technical quality cannot be adequately defined in the specifications or statement of work but must be inferred from each offeror's proposal, the evaluation approach is "Best Value".

## 5. DEFINITIONS.

a. The 1991 Defense Authorization Act gave Defense agencies the authority to make awards based on the offerors best terms (price, management, or technical terms - FAR 52.215-16). Prior to the Act, Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) could only award contracts issued in accordance with FAR 15 negotiation procedures to the lowest priced initial offeror.

b. This method of awarding contracts on best terms is commonly referred to as "BEST VALUE" procurement. The term, "best value", (currently) has no statutory or regulatory definition. It is commonly used to refer to source selections where the award decision is based upon a trade-off between the price offered and other features of the proposal. Such features may include past performance, quality, technical, management, schedule or small business considerations.

c. Sometimes such trade-offs are referred to as "cost/benefit analysis" or "total life cycle cost analysis". Irrespective of the name, the procedure requires the making of judgements as to whether the price difference between competing proposals are justified by other features.

d. Formal Source Selection. A source selection process is considered "formal" when a specific evaluation group structure is established to evaluate proposals and select the source for contract award. The source selection organization typically consists of an evaluation board, advisory council, and designated source selection authority at a management level above that of the contracting officer. When using formal source selection, the agency head or a designee shall ensure: (1) the official responsible for the source selection is formally designated as the Source Selection Authority (SSA); (2) the source selection authority formally establishes an evaluation group structure appropriate to requirements of the particular solicitation; and; (3) before conducting any pre-solicitation conferences (FAR 15.404) or issuing the solicitation, the source selection authority approves a source selection plan.

e. Informal Source Selection. A source selection process is considered "informal" when the PCO is source selection authority. In using informal procedures, establishment of small subcommittees does not necessarily make the procedure formal if the PCO remains the selection official.

f. Source Selection. The entire process by which the government examines and evaluates the facts leading up to the award decision in a competitive acquisition. A diverse array of technical, managerial, and professional skills are usually required to formulate and express the Government's requirements in a solicitation and to evaluate proposals of competing offerors.

g. Tailoring. The process by which the evaluation method and source selection organization is established on a project-by-project basis to meet specific acquisition objectives. Tailoring will assure a high quality source selection with a minimum investment of time and personnel. There are numerous variations of the source selection organization/process. Formal evaluation boards or advisory councils are not required for all acquisitions. They are expensive and time consuming endeavors. Their use should be the exception rather than the rule, and when used, should be fully justified.

## 6. RESPONSIBILITIES.

a. The agency head, Chief of Engineers, or his designee is responsible for formal source selection. When using formal source selection, the secretary or his designee shall ensure that the procedures at FAR Subpart 15.612 are adhered to.

b. SSA is the selecting Government official in charge of the source. This title is most often used in formal source selection and the SSA is other than the PCO.

c. The PCO is responsible for selecting the source unless SSA has been designated.

d. The project manager is responsible for developing the project specific evaluation factors and will chair the Management Evaluation Board in formal source selection.

e. The cost engineer developing the IGE will chair the Cost Evaluation Board in formal source selection.

f. The technical office most familiar with the technical aspects of the project are responsible for the technical requirements related to both the formal and informal source selection process and will chair the Technical Evaluation Board in formal source selection.

## 7. POLICY AND PROCEDURES.

a. Source Selection Planning. A successful source selection does not just happen. It requires an adequate plan of actions and events (to include monitoring) and an established time frame to accomplish the source selection. Appendix B provides a sample list of major milestones for successful planning. The Source Selection Plan (SSP) is the written guide for the source selection process. The SSP is used to:

(1) Translate objectives stated in the acquisition strategy and the acquisition plan into a specific approach for soliciting and evaluating the proposals of offerors.

(2) Communicate this approach as the recommendation of the project manager (PM), PCO, and Office of Counsel (OC) through the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) to the Source Selection Authority (SSA). When informal source selection procedures are utilized and the SSA is the contracting officer, the SSP is prepared by the PM, reviewed by Contracting Directorate, OC, and key SSEB members prior to forwarding to the PCO. The SSP is approved by the PCO at preliminary design stage.

(3) Serve as a directive to the SSEB.

(4) Provide essential guidance to writers of the request for proposal as to what should be emphasized in the solicitation.

(5) Describe the criteria and the techniques used to evaluate the proposals.

In summary, the SSP describes how proposals are solicited from industry; how proposals are evaluated, rated, and summarized after receipt; and how proposals are negotiated. The SSP should also reflect who will evaluate proposals, composition of the SSEB, representation of required functional areas, determination of security needs, small business considerations, and a timetable for contract execution. In substance, the SSP is the Government's description of how it intends to purchase what it wants. It emphasizes the relative importance of each item of source selection criteria. The SSP should be simple and concise, yet cover all essential elements. The SSP must be approved by the SSA before conducting any pre-solicitation conference or issuing the solicitation. As a minimum, the SSP must include:

- (a) A description of the organization structure;
- (b) Proposed pre-solicitation activities;
- (c) A summary of the acquisition strategy;

(d) A statement of the proposed evaluation factors and any significant subfactors and their relative importance.

(e) A description of the evaluation process, methodology, and techniques used; and

(f) A schedule of significant milestones.

Appendix A contains a sample SSP. However, each plan must be tailored to meet specific acquisition objectives.

b. Evaluation Factors.

(1) After Section C, "Specifications", Section M, "Evaluation Factors" is arguably the most important section of the solicitation or Section 0100 for Construction solicitation. Simply stated, to purchase something, we must know what we want. This concept is often ignored. Frequently the focus is on preparation of specifications and meeting deadlines. When such is the focus, a contract specialist often is tasked to write up the source selection criteria. Usually a contract specialist does not know the specific technical attributes that can make or break the buy.

(2) The PM, customer, technical, and contract personnel must determine during the early stage of the acquisition what the important aspects of the contract are. After these aspects are agreed upon, the team must prepare sufficient detailed evaluation factors to ensure the source selection is based on the most important aspects of the solicitation.

(3) Take care during drafting of the evaluation factors since the source selection official may be held to the procedures described.

(4) Tailor the factors considered in evaluating proposals to each acquisition and include only those factors which will have an impact on the source selection process.

(5) The technical and management evaluation factors that apply to an acquisition and the relative importance of those factors are discretionary. However, price or cost to the Government are essential evaluation factors in every source selection. In addition, the extent of participation of small and small disadvantaged businesses in performance of the contract shall be evaluated in every source selection. Quality also must be addressed in every source selection. In evaluation factors, quality is expressed in terms of technical excellence, management capability, personnel qualifications, prior experience, past performance, and timely completion. Include any other relevant

factors, such as cost realism safety, and if awarding a follow-on contract, include incumbency factors.

(6) While the lowest price or lowest total cost to the Government is properly the deciding factor in many source selections, in certain acquisitions the Government may select the source whose proposal offers the greatest value to the Government in terms of performance, quality, and other factors.

(7) In awarding a cost reimbursement contract, the cost proposal should not be controlling, since advance estimates of cost are not necessarily valid indicators of final actual costs. The award of cost reimbursement contracts primarily on the basis of estimated costs may encourage the submission of unrealistically low estimates and increase the likelihood of cost overruns. The primary consideration is to determine which offeror can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, as determined by evaluation of proposals according to the established evaluation criteria.

(8) For service contracts where the required tasks can be clearly defined and objectively evaluated, the technical factors should not be so heavily weighted as to become the dominant evaluation criteria. Evaluation and award is based on best overall value to the Government in terms of quality and other factors. The weighing of costs is commensurate with the nature of the services being acquired. It is appropriate to award to an offeror, based on technical and quality considerations, at other than the lowest price when: (1) the effort being contracted for departs from clearly defined efforts; or (2) highly skilled personnel are required. It is appropriate to award to the technically acceptable offeror with the lowest price when: (1) services being acquired are of a routine or simple nature; (2) highly skilled personnel are not required; or (3) the product is clearly defined at the outset of the acquisition.

(9) The use of responsibility type evaluation factors is not prohibited. However, the contracting officer shall use discretion when using responsibility type evaluation factors. The GAO in Sanford and Sons Company, B-231607 September 20, 1988, 88-2 CPD 266 found that the PCO used responsibility type evaluation factors to avoid issuing a negative responsibility determination and subsequently forwarded the decision to the Small Business Administration for possible issuance of a Certificate of Competency (COC). Using such factors to avoid COC procedures may delay the procurement if protested.

(10) The solicitation shall clearly state the evaluation factors, including cost or price, cost or price related factors, and non-cost or non-price related factors, and any significant

subfactors that will be considered in making the source selection and their relative importance. It is Army policy to evaluate cost or price, but neither are scored or otherwise combined with other aspects of the proposal evaluation. Numerical weights, employed in the evaluation of factors other than price, are not disclosed in the solicitation. The solicitation must inform offerors of minimum requirements that apply to particular evaluation factors and significant subfactors.

(11) Structure evaluation criteria at a level of detail sufficient to discover those advantages, disadvantages, and deficiencies of offers directly associated with significant tasks of the required service (or significant aspects of required item). Mere recitation of top level criteria such as "Technical" and "Management" is insufficient. Evaluation criteria must communicate a clear understanding to the offeror of the intended basis of award. All TAD solicitations utilizing source selection procedures will contain the following narrative in Section M or Section 0100 for construction solicitations (this narrative is in addition to any clauses or provisions required in Section M by FAR):

"Award will be made to that offeror whose proposal contains the combination of those criteria offering the best overall value to the Government. This will be determined by comparing difference(s) in the value of technical and management features with difference(s) in cost to the Government. (Insert here either narrative a, b, or c from the below listing)...."

Next the PCO, in concert with the customer and project execution team must decide which factor is most important, i.e., technical or management most important; technical, management and cost of equal importance; or, cost most important. After selecting the most important factor, the PCO will incorporate one of the following paragraphs substantially as written:

**a. TECHNICAL OR MANAGEMENT MOST IMPORTANT**

In making this comparison, the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical or management features than with making an award at the lowest overall cost to the Government. However, the Government will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to the Government to achieve slightly superior technical or management features.

**b. TECHNICAL, MANAGEMENT AND COST OF EQUAL IMPORTANCE**

In making this comparison, the Government is concerned with striking the most advantageous balance between technical and management features and the cost to the Government.

**c. COST MOST IMPORTANT**

In making this comparison, the Government is more concerned with making an award at the lowest overall cost to the Government than with obtaining superior technical or management features. However, the Government will not make an award based on a proposal with significantly inferior technical or management features to achieve a small savings in cost to the Government.

(12) This language provides the offerors the essential information necessary to understand the logic the Government will use in making the source selection.

**c. Proposal Evaluation**

(1) Prior to authorizing the evaluation team to start their evaluation the contracting office shall assure that:

(a) The team is completely briefed on the evaluation criteria.

(b) The team understands the evaluation criteria and will follow only the evaluation criteria in evaluating each offerors proposal.

(c) A member of OC is assigned to the evaluation team as a non-voting advisor. OC is responsible for advising the team during their evaluation deliberations. To insure fairness, it is essential to evaluate all proposals in compliance with the solicitation's evaluation criteria.

(2) The importance of complete documentation of the evaluation results can not be over emphasized. The GAO in Programmatic, Inc; Telesynetics Corporation, decision B-228916.2, B-228916.3, January 14, 1988, 88-1 CPD 35, thoroughly scrutinized the records signed and or prepared by both the OC and the technical evaluation team. The GAO found that the evaluation team's worksheets provided neither "an adequate nor rational basis for the evaluation team's recommendation." So, the GAO will sustain a protest if the records do not contain sufficient information to justify the award decision.

(3) Proposal evaluation is an assessment of both the proposal and the offeror's ability (as conveyed by the proposal) to successfully accomplish the prospective contract. Competitive proposals are evaluated solely on the factors specified in the solicitation. Evaluation results on each offer must be stated in terms of the solicitation requirement and each proposal's advantages and disadvantages, its deficiencies, and the effect of



these elements should the offer be accepted. The results are recapped in detailed narrative format. Do not use terms such as "shortcomings" or "weaknesses".

(4) Cost or price evaluation. The PCO must use cost or price analysis to evaluate the cost estimate or price, not only to determine whether it is reasonable, but also to determine the offeror's understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract. As previously stated, cost or price must be evaluated but not scored or otherwise combined with other aspects of the proposal evaluation.

(5) Cost Realism Analysis

(a) Cost Realism Analysis is the analysis tool of choice for cost contracts. This analysis technique evaluates each offeror's technical proposal against the offeror's proposed costs. This technique requires considerable judgement as the evaluator must determine if the methods the offeror proposes to perform the scope of work can be reasonably accomplished within the proposed costs. Note that cost realism analysis techniques may be used on fixed price solicitations.

(b) Perform a cost realism analysis on all offerors within the competitive range when a cost type contract award is planned. Use this analysis in the cost, technical, and management areas of the offeror's proposal.

(c) The analysis will determine the probable cost to the Government of the offeror's performance of the contract. If it appears to the evaluation team that any offeror's approach(es) or plan(s) for accomplishing the proposed work will require modification to become acceptable to the Government, the evaluation team shall identify and assess the modification(s) required, determine the probable cost of such modification(s), and include that probable cost assessment in its report.

(d) The probable cost shall reflect the evaluation team's best estimate of the cost of any contract which might result from that offeror's proposal, including any recommended additions or reductions in personnel, equipment, or materials. To the extent that the recommended additions or reductions reflect a lack of understanding of the requirements of the solicitation, that lack of understanding shall be reflected in the narrative scoring of the applicable evaluation factor(s).

(6) Technical evaluation. Offers shall be evaluated on criteria which encompass all factors having a significant bearing on the utility of the item, construction or service being

acquired, and all factors which may affect the cost to the government of acquiring the item, construction, or service. Whenever technical evaluation is necessary beyond ensuring the proposal meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation, the cognizant technical official shall include in the technical evaluation documentation the following:

(a) The basis for evaluation;

(b) An analysis of the technically acceptable and unacceptable proposals, including an assessment of each offeror's ability to accomplish the technical requirements. The assessment should be based on quantifiable and non-quantifiable discriminators.

(c) A summary, matrix, or quantitative ranking of each technical proposal in relation to the best rating possible. Individual evaluator or unit scores will not be averaged or otherwise manipulated mathematically to produce a single raw score for any criterion or subcriterion. Establish scores as the result of a consensus of the evaluators and not by vote. Where divergent evaluation opinions exist, and once it is clear none of the evaluators have misinterpreted or misunderstood any aspects of the proposal(s), the chairman of the evaluation team will provide source selection authority (normally the PCO) with written majority and minority opinions.

(d) A summary of findings.

(7) Competitive range

(a) Normally, the Chairman, SSEB is tasked with making a recommendation to the PCO (or through PCO to SSA) as to which proposals are in the competitive range for purpose of conducting written or oral discussions. Competitive range is determined on the basis of cost or price and other factors stated in the solicitation and will include all proposals having a reasonable chance of being selected for award. When there is doubt whether a proposal is in the competitive range, **the proposal should be included in the competitive range.**

(b) PCO is responsible for notifying in writing an unsuccessful offeror at the earliest practicable time that its proposal is no longer eligible for award.

(8) Written or oral discussion

(a) Award may be made without discussion only if the solicitation notified all offerors the Government intended to award the contract without discussions and the award is in fact made

without any written or oral discussions with any offeror. Discussion, as defined by the FAR, means any oral or written communication involving information essential for determining the acceptability of a proposal or provides the offeror an opportunity to revise or modify its proposal. Minor clarifications are permitted which would not constitute "discussions". Clarification, as defined by FAR, means communication with an offeror for the sole purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, or apparent clerical mistakes. Clarification does not give the offeror an opportunity to revise or modify its proposal (except to the extent correction of apparent clerical mistakes results in a revision). If discussions are held with one offeror under the guise of clarifications, the contract action may be suspended if a competing offeror discovers they were excluded from discussions and protest to the GAO.

(b) Except as provided in subparagraph 6e(1), the PCO must conduct written or oral discussions with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within the competitive range. The content and extent of discussions is a matter of the contracting officer's judgement, based on particular facts of each acquisition.

(c) The PCO is responsible for: (1) controlling all discussions; (2) advising the offeror of deficiencies in its proposal so the offeror is given an opportunity to satisfy Government requirements; and (3) providing the offeror a reasonable opportunity to submit any cost or price, technical, or other revisions to its proposal which may result from discussions.

(9) Best and final offers.

(a) Upon completion of discussions, the PCO must issue a request for best and final offers to all offerors still within the competitive range. Oral requests for best and final offers must be confirmed in writing.

(b) The request for best and final offers (BAFO) must include: (1) notice that discussions have been concluded; (2) notice that this is the opportunity to submit a best and final offer; (3) a common cutoff date and time that **allows a reasonable opportunity for submission of written best and final offers**; and, (4) notice that if any modification is submitted, it must be received by the date and time specified.

(c) After receipt of BAFO, the PCO should not reopen discussions unless it is clearly in the Government's best interest to do so. When utilizing formal source selection procedures, the Chief of Engineers must approve second or subsequent requests for BAFO. When using other than formal source

selection procedures, the field office commander may approve second or subsequent requests for BAFO. Avoid multiple BAFO, if at all possible. The Government runs risk of a protest to GAO alleging auction techniques. Auction techniques are prohibited by FAR.

(d) Following evaluation of BAFO, the PCO (or other designated source selection authority) shall select that source whose BAFO is most advantageous to the Government, considering only price and the other factors included in the solicitation. In performing source selection the PCO may conduct a cost benefit analysis. The methodology focuses on identifying "discriminators" which will identify items of material differences between the proposals and analyzing the impact of these differences on achieving goals. The discriminators are generally categorized into two groups, "quantifiable and non-quantifiable". Quantifiable discriminators are used in the analysis of benefits to be gained in terms of dollars. Non-quantifiable discriminators are used in the subjective analysis of impact on organizational structure, past performance impacts on delivery, and other subjective issues.

#### 8. PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY AND SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION.

a. Protect proprietary and source selection information from unauthorized disclosure in accordance with the guidance in FAR 3.104-5(b). In accordance with FAR 3.104-5(c), mark all source selection information on the cover page and each additional page containing such information with the following legend:

**"SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION--SEE FAR 3.104--PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY"**

b. If source selection information is received from another office and is not marked with the above legend, the Director or Office Chief responsible for the acquisition will assure the information is immediately marked with the above legend. Additionally, immediately request the originating activity, via written memorandum, to mark all copies of source selection information with the above legend. Place a copy of all such memorandums in the official contract file. Examples of source selection information which may originate in organizations other than the contracting offices are: Technical evaluation plans, technical evaluations of proposals, and source selection memorandums.

c. In accordance with FAR 3.104-5(d)1), only the PCO has authority to authorize personnel outside the contracting office to receive proprietary or source selection information. Within the contracting office, only those personnel with a need to know may have access to proprietary or source selection information. Release such information only when the PCO determines release is

20 January 1995

TADP 715-1-7

necessary for the conduct of the procurement. This authority may not be delegated below the PCO. When proprietary information or source selection information is authorized for release outside the contracting office, accomplish the release by memorandum, signed by the PCO. Each memorandum will clearly notify the recipient the information is proprietary or source selection information related to the conduct of a TAD procurement whose disclosure is restricted by Section 27 of Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423) as amended. The act is commonly referred to as Procurement Integrity in FAR 3.104.

d. In accordance with FAR 3.104-5(d), this paragraph (d) 7 applies only to contracts and contract modifications estimated to exceed \$100,000.00:

(1) When proprietary or source selection information is authorized for release outside the contracting office to other TAD organizations, request the organization receiving information to provide the identity within 10 working days of all the persons or classes of persons authorized access to the information, and to the maximum extent possible, the names of all individuals within classes of persons who have been authorized access to the proprietary or source selection information. Include this list in the official contract file. Examples of classes of persons are: (1) Attorneys in TAD, by name if possible, (2) personnel duly appointed to the TAD Contract Review Board (this subparagraph does not apply to these individuals). The examples are illustrative to demonstrate classes of persons.

(2) When proprietary or source selection information is authorized for release to Government activities outside TAD, request in the release memorandum, the individual receiving information to maintain a list of persons, a list of classes of persons and, to the maximum extent possible, names of all individuals within classes of persons authorized access to the proprietary or source selection information. Additionally, the memorandum will request the receiving activity forward the list within 10 working days to the PCO for inclusion in the contract file. Subparagraph 3 applies to these individuals.

e. Proprietary or source selection information is not authorized for release outside the government. In some cases, such information may be authorized for release outside the government only in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

f. Each applicable contract file will meet the record keeping requirements of FAR 3.104-9(e).

20 January 1995

g. In accordance with FAR 15.313-2(e), place the following notice on the cover sheet of all proposals received in response to solicitations issued in accordance with FAR 15 procedures:

**GOVERNMENT NOTICE FOR HANDLING PROPOSALS**

**This proposal shall be used and disclosed for evaluation purposes only and a copy of this Government notice shall be applied to any reproduction or abstract thereof. Any authorized restrictive notices which the submitter places on this proposal shall also be strictly complied with.**

Appendix  
APP A-Eval & Scoring  
    Sample Plan  
APP B-Milestones  
    Sample

/s/  
NICHOLAS J. KOLAR, JR.  
LTC, EN  
Deputy Commander

## APPENDIX A

**CLOSE HOLD - ONLY THOSE WITH NEED TO KNOW SHOULD SEE EVALUATION OF RESPONSES**

1. PURPOSE. This section specifies the evaluation process. It includes evaluation criteria and scoring. The objective of the RFP process is to:

a. Provide necessary information to the PCO for selecting the best contractor.

b. Assure an impartial, equitable, and thorough evaluation of each proposal submitted.

c. Assure cost effective expenditure of Government funds.

d. Assure compliance with the FAR.

2. SELECTION PROCESS.

After receipt of proposals, the major milestones for the selection process are as follows:

a. Screening of proposals received for overall responsiveness

b. Request for clarifications from offerors, as requested

c. Detailed evaluation of proposals

d. Competitive range determination

e. PCO eliminates proposals not within the competitive range

f. Preparation/continuation of detailed evaluation for oral discussions with offerors

g. Oral discussions with offerors

h. Request for Best & Final Offers

i. Receipt of Best & Final Offers

j. Evaluation of Best & Final Offers

k. Present recommendation to PCO

l. Decision by PCO

- m. Approval by SSA
  - n. Award contract
  - o. Debriefing of unsuccessful offerors
3. Evaluation factors are divided sequentially into the following phases:
- a. planning and design;
  - b. construction;
  - c. operation and maintenance and
  - d. remediation.

Each phase has a Technical and Management Component and the whole operation has a Cost Component. For evaluation purposes, the Technical Component and the Management Component are of equal value and the evaluations are intermixed on the scoring sheets. The price proposal will not be a scored factor, but will be evaluated as to reasonableness, realism, and affordability in the evaluation process.

#### 4. RATING, RANKING, AND SCORING.

a. Rating System. The two principal methods of rating evaluation factors are numerical and adjective. Both methods will be utilized for this procurement. The adjective scoring system and its criteria are as follows:

DEFINITIONS OF RATING CRITERIA: The following criteria will be used to describe, by a narrative, the conclusive advantages, disadvantages, and deficiencies of each proposal evaluated. Items that need clarification/negotiation will be described. The basis for rating is as follows:

Outstanding. To receive this rating, the offeror must satisfy all requirements of solicitation for this element and exceed most. In addition, the offeror has an outstanding approach and special qualification for the element being evaluated. The offeror demonstrates either through experience or effective preparation, he can bring some special contribution to this element of the project. The offeror has successful experience that is very specifically applicable to this element of the project.

Excellent. To receive this rating, the offeror must satisfy all requirements of the solicitation for this element and exceed most. Offeror demonstrates, through experience, he is highly qualified to



perform this element of the project. The offeror has similar experience highly applicable to this element of the project.

Satisfactory. To receive this rating, the offeror must satisfy all requirements of solicitation for this element. The offeror demonstrates his organization can reasonably be expected to perform this element of the project. The offeror has experience which can be applied to this element of the project.

Poor. To receive this rating, the offeror satisfies most, but not all, requirements of the solicitation for this element and is susceptible to being made satisfactory through revision of the originally submitted materials.

Unacceptable. To receive this rating, the offeror has major omissions or misunderstandings or has completely omitted details which would indicate the offeror's understanding of the requirements. The proposal cannot meet requirements without major revisions.

b. Rating Technique. The following rating technique shall be used for each of the four phases:

(1) Each evaluator should make an independent evaluation and assign an adjective rating to each of the assigned evaluation factors utilizing the factor evaluation worksheet (Annex A-D). Individual ratings will be supported by rationale for that rating.

(2) Upon completion of analysis, evaluation and rating of each of the individual evaluation elements, the evaluator shall enter a composite rating for each on the evaluation work sheet provided. Evaluation results will be documented with a narrative discussion of the value of each offeror in terms of its advantages and disadvantages, its deficiencies, and the effect of these elements on the Government.

(3) Upon completion of individual evaluations the group should meet in committee with the chairman, attempt to reach a consensus and arrive at a single adjective score for each element, supported by a compilation of the individual evaluators narrative advantages and disadvantages.

(4) The committee chairman will provide input to the Source Selection Board chairman who will use this information to formulate the final report to the contracting officer.

c. Discussions within the Committees. While individual committee members may have specific expertise in one functional area, each committee member should independently consider all elements assigned to him unless otherwise determined by the Chairman or by consensus of the committee(s). This serves

several purposes. It allows an overview of each element and insures all interrelationships of elements are discussed. Full discussions of all matters considered by the Board are encouraged and differences of opinion will be examined with the objective of reaching a consensus or common understanding of the issues where there are differing views. When a consensus cannot be reached, minority views will be recorded.

d. Ranking Technique. Upon receipt of the Committee findings, the Committee Chairman shall rank the proposals utilizing the following method:

(1) Adjectives of Outstanding, Excellent, Satisfactory, Poor, and Unacceptable will be assigned scores as follows:

OUTSTANDING	10 points
EXCELLENT	8 points
SATISFACTORY	6 points
POOR	4 points
UNACCEPTABLE	2 points

(2) Utilizing the Proposal Scoring Sheets provided, the Chairman shall then enter the numeric value of each criteria in the space provided. The overall proposal rating shall be developed as follows:

Sum of Individual Criteria Assigned Scores = Criteria  
Rating for each Phase

Sum of Each Phase Criteria Ratings = Overall Rating

(3) Proposals shall be ranked according to overall ratings.

## 5. COST/PRICE EVALUATION

a. In cost/price evaluation, the offeror's cost/price is viewed in comparison to the Government estimate, other offers, RFP, and offeror's technical proposal and to provide an assessment of the reasonableness, realism and affordability of the proposed price.

b. Offeror's price/cost proposals shall not be made available to technical evaluators during the in-depth technical evaluation periods, initial and subsequent. Immediately after submittal of the technical scores, price or cost evaluators should discuss the details of technical proposals with the technical evaluators to aid in their evaluation of costs associated with labor categories and hours, materials, manufacturing processes, and other elements of cost. Price/cost evaluators may also use DCAA Audit Reports and the Contract Administration Office Field Price Analysis Reports.

c. In addition to cost/price analysis, further measurement of cost or price reasonableness shall be made. This can be accomplished by comparing Government cost estimates with proposed cost/price after considering the risk associated with technical approach and disposition of deficiencies.

d. The cost committee should initiate and maintain a cost track to facilitate an understanding of the changes leading to final cost/price.

e. Following completion of cost/price evaluation, the Evaluation Chairman compiles cost/price information, and integrates findings with technical evaluations and provides results to the PCO. The PCO should be provided the cost team's findings as to the realism of each offeror's proposal. If a proposal is determined to be unrealistic, reasons for this conclusion should be stated, and a realistic cost/price developed.

## 6. ESTABLISHING THE COMPETITIVE RANGE

a. The competitive range is the unspecified point below which an offeror's proposal is not considered as having a reasonable chance of selection for final award and whose proposal is not susceptible to being made acceptable. Offerors below the range may be eliminated from further consideration. The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) recommends to the PCO which offers should be considered within the competitive range and provides specific reasons. However, final determination as to which offerors remain within the competitive range rests with the PCO.

b. The key to establishing a competitive range is whether the offeror has a reasonable chance of selection. If the offeror has a reasonable chance, he must be considered within the competitive range. For example, the initial evaluation ratings for four offerors are: Outstanding, Excellent, Poor, and Unacceptable. In this case, a logical competitive range can be established at the Excellent level since the two remaining offers may be well out of competition.

c. The initial number of proposals considered within the competitive range may be reduced when, as a result of the written or oral discussions, and BAFO any such proposal has been determined to no longer have a reasonable chance of being selected for award. This decision again rests with the PCO.

## 7. REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATIONS AND ORAL PRESENTATIONS

a. After initial evaluation of the offeror's original submission, the SSEB will provide the PCO with a written list of items that require clarification or which are apparent deficiencies.

specific evaluation is not revealed. For example, the offeror should not be told he is three personnel short in the specific functional area of QA/QC, but rather it appears he cannot accomplish the RFP requirements with his cited staffing.

b. After the offeror has responded to the first request for clarifications and that response has been evaluated, it may be necessary to go back to him for additional clarifications. Usually this is done in a face to face oral discussion process or by telephone. As with written requests, all oral input by the Government team should be formatted and approved prior to the discussions. This meeting is also an opportunity for the offeror to review any remaining deficiencies and if necessary ask any further questions of the Government relative to the RFP. Government team members should be cautioned against making spontaneous statements that may tend to "lead" the offerors. Any responses to oral discussion must be reasserted in the BAFO.

## 8. DOCUMENTING THE EVALUATION

a. When the evaluation begins with proposal review by committee members, their written records and notes become the foundation of the documentation process. In order to provide a systematic method of keeping this documentation, worksheets have been produced that list all of the evaluation elements relative to the evaluation. The worksheets include space for the evaluator to make any notes or comments regarding the proposal advantages and disadvantages. The committee will then discuss the proposals and establish final ratings for the various elements. The committee chairman will, based on the committee's input, prepare documentation required to support the final conclusion of the committee. The committee chairman is also responsible for developing items for Clarification/Oral Discussion worksheets (Encl 5). The Chairman of the SSEB has responsibility for developing the documentation supporting the SSEB's finding and the listing of items the negotiation team will use in negotiations. The Chairman of the SSEB is responsible for preparing the final report and briefing to the PCO.

b. Upon completion of the selection process, all documentation shall be turned over to the PCO to be placed in the Official Contract File. Redundant or extraneous documentation should be screened and destroyed by the chairman of the SSEB.

## 9. SSEB REPORT AND BRIEFING

a. After completion of the evaluation phase, the Board prepares a report of its findings and conclusions, outlining the consensus of the Board and its composite ratings. The Board chairman (technical/management and cost) signs the report to confirm it represents collective opinions. If any member of the

Board has serious reservations about any part of a proposal, these should be considered for possible adjustment of scoring. If not reconciled, but considered critical to the evaluation, the dissenting opinion should be forwarded with the report. The dissenting opinion shall be stated in the form of a minority report. The SSEB report shall contain the following:

- table of contents.
- brief description of the services to be contracted.
- listing of name, functional title, and assignment of all members of the SSEB, and any other person(s) who took part in the Board activities.
- chronology of the major events connected with the source selection evaluation process.
- alphabetical listing of the offerors who submitted proposals, with major subcontractors, if appropriate.
- description of the methodology used by the Board to evaluate proposals, including the rating plan and techniques used in the evaluation (this document can be included as an annex).
- reasons for elimination of any proposals before the evaluation process, such as late submission, failure to meet RFP requirements, etc.
- rationale used to determine competitive range, and basis for elimination of any proposals.
- method used to verify experience and performance record of offerors in the competitive range and results thereof, including comments on major contracts performed for the U.S. Government.
- alphabetical order (BY OFFEROR).
- description of the elements.
- how each offeror in the competitive range proposed to meet each element in order to present an overview and understanding of each offeror's approach.
- Board's composite scoring of proposals and a summary of significant differences among proposals. Major advantages and disadvantages of each proposal in the competitive range and the potential for correction of deficiencies should also be discussed.
- information on offeror's financial capability to perform under the proposed contract.

- comments on offeror's Equal Employment Opportunity, Small Business, Minority Business Programs, and proposed Subcontracting Plan.

- any special areas of concern which would help the PCO in arriving at his decision.

- any areas to be addressed in definitization (i.e., advance agreements not resolved).

b. In addition to the SSEB report, the SSEB Chairman and Committee Chairman may conduct oral presentations of the Board's findings and conclusions following completion of evaluation and analysis concerning the procurement action, and to permit an informed selection of the best offeror.

#### 10. PREPARATION OF SELECTION STATEMENT

a. After the selection decision has been made, the SSEB Chairman, and the Recorder will prepare a Selection Statement. The Selection Statement will not contain specific weights or scores. It should be concise and include the following:

- Brief description of procurement.
- Name of firm selected for award.

b. The PCO will sign and date the Selection Statement and the original will be included in the Official Contract Files.

#### 11. DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL OFFERORS

a. All unsuccessful offerors will be offered a formal debriefing. The Debriefing Team will consist of PCO, SSEB Chairman, legal advisors, and Committee Chairmen. These debriefings should be confined to areas in which the offeror could have improved his proposal, and should not reveal confidential business information nor discuss relative merits of other proposals. Debriefings will be provided at the earliest feasible time which normally shall be after award of the contract.

b. Purpose of the debriefing is to enable offeror to understand why his proposal was not selected with the objective of improving future proposals submitted to the Government. Therefore, no comparisons should be made to other proposals and specific weights and scoring should not be revealed or discussed. The debriefing should ordinarily comment on the following areas:

- Overview of SSEB process.
- Review of RFP.

- Discussion of advantages and deficiencies in offeror proposal.
- Questions by offeror.

- Request for comments from the offeror on selection process (e.g., RFP, preproposal conference, negotiations, etc.).

c. A memorandum for record of debriefings with each unsuccessful offeror should be prepared and should address who was present, what transpired and what questions were raised by the offeror.

## 12. MILESTONES.

### MILESTONES

Event	Date
-------	------

SSEB Appointments	
-------------------	--

Solicitation Approved	
-----------------------	--

Solicitation Issued	
---------------------	--

Solicitation Closing Date	
---------------------------	--

SSEB Evaluations	
------------------	--

NOTE: DATES WILL BE ESTABLISHED UPON RECEIPT OF FUNDING.

### Encls

1. Structure of SSEB
2. Special Order Appointment of SSEB Members
3. Proposal Scoring Sheet

13. Selection of firms will be based on the following evaluation factors listed in order of priority for operation and maintenance, planning and design (including obtaining permits), remediation and construction.

a. Planning and design evaluation factors are:

(1) Experience of firm in design of material handling facilities and in particular those that had reduction and disposal as a component, facility management, construction management, cost estimating, environmental monitoring, geotechnical investigations, preparation of facility development plans, and in obtaining permits from regulatory agencies,

(2) Resources consisting of staff, equipment, and finances,

- (3) Past performance in a related activity,
- (4) Familiarization with project,
- (5) Techniques of written presentation.

b. Construction evaluation factors are:

- (1) resources consisting of finances, management, equipment, and work capacity,
- (2) experience in construction of major material handling facilities and fast tracking getting systems on line,
- (3) past performance,
- (4) familiarization with project, and
- (5) techniques of written presentation.

c. Operation and Maintenance evaluation factors are:

- (1) Firm experience in operation, maintenance, training, preparation of O&M manuals for material handling facilities,
- (2) management facility operation experience,
- (3) past experience in operating a waste reduction facility within standards and record of complaints from relevant interests. Following receipt of technical proposals the Corps of Engineers (CE) will evaluate the technical proposals and select the most suitable offeror. Cost proposals will then be requested and a maximum guaranteed price will be negotiated for the Debris Processing Facility.



Annex A to Appendix A

EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
DETAILED EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

PLANNING AND DESIGN  
(DESIGN/CONSTRUCT)

Project\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate firm\_\_\_\_\_

Date of submittal of written proposal\_\_\_\_\_

(Maximum points 250)

Points

Rating

1. Firms Experience - 90 points maximum

a. Design of material handling facilities	10	_____
b. Design of those that had reduction and disposal as a component	10	_____
c. Facility management	10	_____
d. Construction management	10	_____
e. Material handling and/or reduction cost estimating	10	_____
f. Environmental monitoring	10	_____
g. Geotechnical investigations	10	_____
h. Preparation of facility development plans	10	_____
i. Obtaining permits from regulatory agencies	10	_____

2. Offeror Pertinent Resources available for this project -  
60 points maximum

a. Staff	20	_____
(1) Sanitary		
(2) Structural		
(3) Mechanical		
(4) Electrical		
(5) Geotechnical		
(6) Environmental		
(7) Instrumentation		
(8) Civil		
(9) Estimator		
(10) Drafting		
(11) Surveying		

b.	Equipment - award points based on available computer, surveying, and material handling equipment including front end loaders, cranes, hauling trucks, incineration equipment, etc.	20	_____
c.	Finances - Determine whether firm is solvent.	20	_____
3.	Past performance in a related activity - 40 points maximum		
a.	In meeting tight design schedules	20	_____
b.	Pertaining to work for CE, other government agencies and private enterprise	20	_____
4.	Familiarization with project as determined from study of written proposal - 40 points maximum		
a.	Services offered are clearly expressed	10	_____
b.	Agree with Scope of Services requested	15	_____
c.	Time proposed for completing the work is supported by analysis and calculations presented in the proposal and is in agreement with the time to accomplish in the RFP.	15	_____
5.	Techniques of written presentation - 20 points maximum		
a.	Essential points covered	10	_____
b.	Effort is directed to project in question	10	_____
6.	Project execution capability is determined from the offeror's proposal		
a.	Project Management execution item		
b.	Management approach and procedures		
c.	Similar protect experience		
d.	Management Information System		
e.	Procurement approach and procedures		
	Subtotal		_____

Annex B to Appendix A

EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
DETAILED EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

CONSTRUCTION

Project\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate firm\_\_\_\_\_

Date of submittal of written proposal\_\_\_\_\_

(Maximum points 100)

Points Rating

1. Firm Pertinent Resources available for this project - 36 points maximum

a. Finance - 18 points

- |  |   |       |
|--|---|-------|
| (1) Liquid assets of at least 15% of amount of estimated annual rates of placement from 1989 thru 1992, or liquid assets in excess of \$80 million | 6 | _____ |
| (2) Liquid assets of at least 10% of amount of estimated annual rates of placement from 1989 thru 1992   | 6 | _____ |
| (3) Liquid assets less than 10% of amount of estimated annual rate of placement from 1989 thru 1992  | 6 | _____ |

b. Management - 9 points maximum

- |  |   |       |
|--|---|-------|
| (1) Management has experience on jobs greater than \$100 million   | 3 | _____ |
| (2) Management has experience on jobs between \$50 million and \$100 million   | 3 | _____ |
| (3) Management has experience on jobs less than \$50 million or adverse comments on management from telephone survey | 3 | _____ |

c. Equipment - 6 points maximum

- |   |   |       |
|---|---|-------|
| (1) Firm owns or will acquire necessary equipment for the job | 2 | _____ |
|---|---|-------|

- |  |   |       |
|--|---|-------|
| (2) Telephone survey indicated equipment problems with past jobs   | 2 | _____ |
| (3) Telephone survey indicated series equipment problems with past jobs  | 2 | _____ |
| d. Free Work Capacity - 3 points maximum   |   |       |
| (1) Contractor estimated annual rate of placement from 1989 thru 1992, no greater than firm's average rate of placement for the last 5 years | 1 | _____ |

Firm: (Construction)\_\_\_\_\_

- |   | <u>Points</u> | <u>Rating</u> |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| (2) Contractor estimated annual rate of placement from 1989 thru 1992, no greater than 20% more than firm's average rate of placement for the last 5 years  | 1             | _____         |
| (3) Contractor estimated annual rate of placement from 1989 thru 1992, greater than 20% more than the firm's average rate of placement for the last 5 years | 1             | _____         |
| 2. <u>Firm's Experience</u> - 24 points maximum   |               |               |

- |   |   |       |
|---|---|-------|
| a. Complexity - 12 points maximum   |   |       |
| (1) Firm has experience with the design and construction of 10 or more material handling projects with more than one being a waste reduction facility | 4 | _____ |
| (2) Firm has experience with design and construction of less than 10 material handling projects   | 4 | _____ |
| (3) Firm has experience on projects involving large numbers of equipment with staging areas   | 4 | _____ |
| b. Magnitude - 9 points maximum   |   |       |
| (1) Firm has experience with design and construction of material handling projects more that \$100 million  | 2 | _____ |

	(2) Firm has experience with design and construction of material handling projects more that \$50-\$100 million	2	_____
	(3) Firm has design and construction experience of projects greater than \$50 million but not on sewer projects	2	_____
	(4) Firm has design or construction experience of projects less than \$50 million but not on sewer projects	3	_____
c.	Fast Track Experience - 3 points maximum		
	(1) Firm has experience on at least one fast track contract valued at \$20 million or greater	1	_____
	(2) Firm has experience on fast track contracts valued at \$1 million to less than \$20 million	1	_____
	(3) Firm has fast track contract experience on contracts of less than \$1 million, or experience reacting to major scope of work changes	1	_____
3.	<u>Past Performance</u> - 18 points maximum		
a.	Quality - To be awarded points based on number of complaints from telephone survey	6	_____
b.	Time - To be based on assessed liquidated damages for delays in meeting completion dates on previous works	6	_____
c.	Safety Record - To be awarded points based on telephone survey	6	_____
4.	<u>Familiarity with Project</u> - 12 points maximum as determined from study of written proposals.		
a.	Services offered are clearly expressed	4	_____
b.	Agree with Scope of Services requested	4	_____
c.	Time proposed is in reasonable agreement with CE time estimate	4	_____

5. Technique of Written Presentation - 10 points maximum

a. Essential points are covered 2 \_\_\_\_\_

Firm: (Construction)\_\_\_\_\_

	<u>Points</u>	<u>Rating</u>
b. Effort is directed to project in question	2	_____
c. Information is well organized	2	_____
d. Graphic aids are utilized	2	_____
e. Proposal format has good appearance	2	_____
Subtotal		_____

Annex C to Appendix A

EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
DETAILED EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

SITE CLOSURE AND REMEDIATION

Project\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate firm\_\_\_\_\_

Date of submittal of written proposal\_\_\_\_\_

	<u>Points</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. <u>Site Closure</u> - 150 points maximum		
a. Demobilization - 60 points maximum		
(1) Burn pit dismantling	10	_____
(2) Ash pile dismantling	10	_____
(3) Stockpile clearing	10	_____
(4) Demobilization of physical structures to include: administration facility, scale-house, maintenance facilities, vehicles, and sanitary sewer	10	_____
(5) Removal of contractors property	10	_____
(6) Schedule	10	_____
b. Remediation - 50 points maximum		
(1) Ground water compliance	25	_____
(2) Soil removal/decontamination	25	_____
c. Restoration - 40 points maximum		
(1) Original grading	15	_____
(2) Erosion control	15	_____
(3) Vegetative cover	10	_____
Subtotal		_____

Annex D to Appendix A

EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
DETAILED EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Project\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate firm\_\_\_\_\_

Date of submittal of written proposal\_\_\_\_\_

(Maximum Points 500)

	<u>Points</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. <u>Firm's Experience</u> - 250 points maximum		
A. Operation		
(1) Firm has experience in the operation of disposal facilities and processes (i.e. chipping, grinding and incineration)	30	
(2) Firm has experience in the operation of recycling processes and systems	30	
(3) Firm has experience in the monitoring of disposal facilities	30	
B. Maintenance		
(1) Firm has experience in the maintenance of disposal facilities and processes (i.e. chipping, grinding and incineration)	60	
(2) Firm has experience in the maintenance of recycling processes and systems	30	
(3) Firm has experience in the maintenance of the monitoring devices of disposal facilities	10	
C. Training - Firm has experience in training personnel for plant operations	20	
D. Preparation of O&M Manuals - Firm has experience in preparation of Operation and Maintenance manuals and their revision to reflect operating experience	40	



2. Management - 150 points maximum

Management staff has experience on plants with  
an annual operation cost greater than  
\$1 million. 150

3. Past Performance - 100 points maximum

Firm has a good record of operating disposal  
facilities to meet environmental standards 100

4. Firm demonstrated interest in project:

Important note: These are negative ratings applied for lack of  
interest. An employee's interest in response to a request is  
expected, and hence no credit is awarded for correctness in  
this regard. In order to impose negative ratings, however,  
evidence of failure to respond promptly or to submit  
punctually, must be clearly established for the record.  
Further the imposition of these negative ratings require  
unanimous committee accord.

Firm: (Construction) \_\_\_\_\_  
Points Rating

A. Failure to respond promptly to RFP -10 to 0 \_\_\_\_

B. Failure to submit proper written proposals -10 to 0 \_\_\_\_

Subtotal \_\_\_\_

Total (Const) \_\_\_\_

Evaluation Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Subtotal \_\_\_\_

Total (PGD) \_\_\_\_

Total (Const) \_\_\_\_

Total (OGM) \_\_\_\_

Total (Remediation) \_\_\_\_

Grand Total (Consortium) \_\_\_\_

Evaluation Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B  
(sample)

MILESTONES FOR (brief description)

Milestone	Days Per Action		Calendar Date	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
1. Receive Funded PR				
2. Review Scope of Work (SOW)				
3. Appoint SSA				
4. Appoint Board Chairperson(s) and Members				
5. Write Source Selection Plan (SSP)				
6. Approve SOW/SSP				
7. Issue Commerce Business Daily (CBD)				
8. Prequalification				
9. Perform Training and Responsibility Briefings				
10. Brief the SSEB Chairperson				
11. Brief the SSEB(s)				
12. Develop Scoring Plan				
13. Develop Evaluation Factors				
14. Independent Government Estimate (IGE)				
15. Identify Negotiation Team				
16. Prepare and Approve RFP				
17. Issue RFP				
18. Closing Date for Proposal Receipt				
19. Screen Proposals for Responsiveness to Solicitation				
20. Initial Evaluation Board(s) Results				
21. Issue Clarifications (if required)				
22. Consensus Evaluations				
23. Evaluation Board Reports				
24. Approve Competitive Range				
25. Request Audit (if required)				
26. Prepare PreBCM (if required)				
27. Conduct Negotiations - Oral/Written				
28. Receive BAFOs				
29. Re-evaluate BAFO Material				
30. Re-open Negotiations (if necessary)				
31. Second BAFO Evaluation (if necessary)				
32. Responsibility Determination				
33. Cost and Pricing Data and Certificate (if required)				
34. Selection Briefing				
35. Prepare and Sign Decision Document				

36. Prepare Post BCM/Waiver
37. Award Approvals and  
Congressional Notification
38. Contract Award
39. Unsuccessful Offerors Notification
40. Debriefings of Offerors
41. CBD Notice Award (if applicable)
42. Lessons Learned Report